



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/749,627	12/28/2000	Surendra Goel	06975-147001/ Search 03	5980

26171 7590 01/30/2007  
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.  
P.O. BOX 1022  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER
----------

SHINGLES, KRISTIE D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2141

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/30/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/749,627

Applicant(s)

GOEL ET AL.

Examiner

Kristie Shingles

Art Unit

2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 November 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 and 20-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 and 20-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Per Applicant's Request for Continued Examination*

*Claims 1, 8 and 17 have been amended.*

*Claims 18 and 19 have been cancelled.*

*Claims 1-17 and 20-23 are pending.*

### *Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114*

I. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/3/2006 has been entered.

### *Response to Arguments*

II. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 8 and 17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

III. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

IV. Claims 1-6, 8-14, 16, 17 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Redfern* (US 6,078,914) in view of *Harris* (US Publication 2006/0149719).

a. Regarding claim 1, *Redfern* teaches a method for displaying web site search results obtained from searching multiple electronic information stores without distinguishing the particular electronic information stores in the display, the method comprising:

- receiving at least one search term and storing internal content at a web host (*Figure 1, col.4 lines 8-53, col.6 lines 4-15, col.8 lines 41-62*);
- comparing, at the web host, the search term with first electronic information within a first electronic information store to determine whether matches exist, and obtaining a first search result that includes the matches that are determined to exist (*col.3 lines 39-45, col.8 line 63-col.9 line 43, col.15 line 50-col.16 line 27—provision for combining hits from each search engine and comparing*);
- comparing the search term with second electronic information to determine whether matches exist, wherein the second electronic 1) is stored within a second electronic information store, 2) is independent of the first result, and 3) includes content provided by a source other than the web host and being made accessible to both the members of the web host and the non-members (*col.8 line 63-col.9 line 43, col.15 line 50-col.16 line 27—provision for combining hits from each search engine, comparing and removing redundancies*); and
- displaying results based on the matches that are determined to exist with the first electronic information and the second electronic information, wherein the results are displayed in a single interface of results comprised of the matches that are determined to exist with the first electronic information and the second electronic information (*col.3 lines 21-45, col.4 lines 8-27, col.10 lines 33-63, col.15 line 50-col.16 line 27—combined results from the search engines are displayed together*).

*Redfern* discloses the use of various types of search engines, such as commercial and proprietary search engine databases based upon the user's identity, which implies the use of search engines accessible only to particular users, such as members/subscribers (*col.9 lines 1-27*). However, *Harris* more explicitly teaches the claimed limitation of the first electronic information including the internal content provided by the web host and being accessible only to

members of the web host in disclosing initiation of a customized search on a subscriber's website including searching the subscriber's data source along with other standard search engines (*page 1 paragraphs 009-0011; page 2 paragraph 0018-0019; page 4 paragraph 0039 and 0041; page 5 paragraph 0044; pages 5-6 paragraphs 0053-0054; page 6 paragraphs 0059-0060; page 8 paragraphs 0074-0075*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of *Redfern* with *Harris* for the purpose of implementing a meta-search system that distributes search queries across multiple search engines and databases—including a member-only web host databases—in order to perform a more exhaustive search of applicable data sources and to provide the user with a comprehensive list of search results pertinent to the user's interest.

b. **Claims 8 and 17** contain limitations that are substantially equivalent to claim 1 and are therefore rejected under the same basis.

c. **Regarding claims 2, 9 and 20**, *Redfern* with *Harris* teach the methods and computer program of claims 1, 8, and 17 wherein displaying results includes displaying results such that whether the results are obtained from the source other than the web host or the web host is transparent to a user viewing the single interface of results (*Redfern: col.4 lines 8-27; Harris: pages 1-2 paragraphs 0010-0013; page 3 paragraph 0031; pages 6-7 paragraphs 0062-0063; page 8 paragraph 0074*).

d. **Regarding claim 3**, *Redfern* with *Harris* teach the method of claim 1, *Redfern* further teaches wherein: receiving at least one search term comprises receiving several search terms and grouping the search terms received as a single string; comparing the search term with

Art Unit: 2141

the first electronic information comprises comparing the single string of search terms with the first electronic information to determine whether matches exist; and comparing the search term with the second electronic information comprises comparing the single string of search terms with the second electronic information to determine whether matches exist (*col.3 lines 39-45, col.4 lines 28-67, col.8 line 63-col.9 line 43, col.10 line 64-col.11 line 54, col.15 line 50-col.16 line 27*).

e. **Regarding claims 4 and 12**, *Redfern* with *Harris* teach the method of claim 1 and 8, *Redfern* further teaches wherein the first electronic information further includes proprietary web content such that comparing the search term with the first electronic information includes comparing the search term with the proprietary web content within the first electronic information store to determine whether matches exist (*col.9 lines 1-27*).

f. **Regarding claims 5 and 13**, *Redfern* with *Harris* teach the method of claim 4 and 12 wherein the second electronic information further includes non-proprietary web content such that comparing the search term with the second electronic information includes comparing the search term with the non-proprietary web content within the second electronic information store to determine whether matches exist (*Redfern: col.9 lines 1-27 and 40-43, col.9 line 66-col.10 line 1, col.15 line 50-col.16 line 27; Harris: page 6 paragraph 0062, page 7 paragraph 0064, page 8 paragraphs 0074*).

g. **Regarding claims 6 and 16**, *Redfern* with *Harris* teach the method of claim 1 and 8, *Redfern* further teaches the method of claim 1 and 8 wherein the results include a ranked list of web site identifiers (*Abstract, col.10 line 64-col.11 line 47*).

h. **Regarding claim 10**, *Redfern* with *Harris* teach the method of claim 8, wherein the second electronic information within the second electronic information store is maintained by the third party search service (*Redfern*: col.8 line 63-col.9 line 43, col.15 line 50-col.16 line 27; *Harris*: page 1 paragraphs 009-0011; page 2 paragraph 0018-0019; page 4 paragraph 0039 and 0041; page 5 paragraph 0044; pages 5-6 paragraphs 0053-0054; page 6 paragraphs 0059-0060; page 8 paragraphs 0074-0075).

i. **Regarding claim 11**, *Redfern* with *Harris* teach the method of claim 8, wherein displaying the first results and the second results includes integrating the first results and the second results without displacing (*Redfern*: col.4 lines 8-27; *Harris*: pages 1-2 paragraphs 0010-0013; page 3 paragraph 0031; pages 6-7 paragraphs 0062-0063; page 8 paragraph 0074).

j. **Regarding claim 14**, *Redfern* with *Harris* teach the method of claim 13 wherein the second electronic information includes information that is proprietary to the third party search service (*Redfern*: col.9 lines 1-27 and 40-43, col.9 line 66-col.10 line 1, col.15 line 50-col.16 line 27; *Harris*: page 6 paragraph 0062, page 7 paragraph 0064, page 8 paragraphs 0074).

V. **Claim 15** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Redfern* (US 6,078,914) in view of *Harris* (US Publication 2006/0149719) in further view of *Andersen* (US 6,122,740).

**Regarding claims 15**, *Redfern* with *Harris* teach the method and claim 8, as applied above, yet fail to explicitly teach wherein the first electronic information within the first

Art Unit: 2141

electronic information store is maintained by an internet service provider. However *Andersen* teaches wherein the data storage for the search engine is on an ISP (*col.6 lines 40-45, col.8 lines 1-4*). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of *Redfern* and *Harris*, which provision the use of multiple search engines, with *Andersen* who teaches that internet service providers (ISP) may include search engines. It is well-known in the art for ISPs to provide searching capabilities for the subscribers of the ISP via data stores and search engines maintained by the ISP.

**VI. Claims 7 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Redfern* (US 6,078,914) in view of *Harris* (US Publication 2006/0149719) in further view of *Singhal* (US 6,370,527).**

a. **Regarding claim 7, *Redfern* with *Harris* teach the method of claim 6, as applied above, yet fail to explicitly teach wherein the results from the matches determined to exist with the internal content from the web host are ranked higher than the results from the matches determined to exist with the content from the source other an the web host.** However *Singhal* teaches that the ranking of the search results list may be based on which search engine produced the results (*col.1 lines 42-49, col.5 lines 4-7, col.6 lines 5-14*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of *Redfern* and *Harris*, which ranking and sorting search results from different search engines, with *Singhal* who teaches that the search results from the different search engines may be ranked according to the particular search engine device which retrieved the results. In the case of a web host, results retrieved from the web host's search engine may be ranked higher to promote preferential selection by the subscriber of the web host.



b. **Regarding claims 21, 22 and 23, Redfern and Harris**, teach the methods and computer program of claims 1, 8, and 17, as applied above, yet fail to explicitly teach wherein the displaying results includes: displaying results from the web host in a first section of the single interface of results; displaying results from the source other than the web host in a second section of the single interface of results, wherein the first section and the second section are physically distinct from each other. However, *Singhal* teaches displaying the search results from different search engines in different section of a webpage (*col.2 lines 35-42*). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of *Redfern and Harris*, which provision the display of search results from different search engines, with *Singhal* who teaches that the search results from the different search engines may be displayed in different section of a webpage; this allows for the user to clearly determine which search engine produced each particular set of search results.

#### *Conclusion*

VII. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Corey et al (5,987,446), Fox et al (6,701,318), Lawrence et al (6,999,959), Kawasaki (6,539,375), Dutta (6,718,365).

VIII. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kristie Shingles whose telephone number is 571-272-3888. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-6:00pm.


Art Unit: 2141

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on 571-272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*Kristie Shingles*  
*Examiner*  
*Art Unit 2141*

*kds*



**RUPAL DHARIA**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**